(The Issue of Insanity)

Dr. Campbell similarly attacks the verdict of "temporary insanity," not by direct denial or even mainly by reference to any particular facts, but by exposing its inner inconsistency. Thus, in the "dialogue" discussed above, he has his straw-man, "Lawyer Blank," juxtapose Dr. Workman's restraint of Mary and his insinuation that she is not really "lunatic" to reveal their incongruity:

> if she was sane why was she "pinioned" to the last, and her father prevented from seeing her? If she was insane, why did Dr. Workman bring forward his nurses to the inquest to report her ravings? (18)

Of course, such an argument employs its own doubtful premises, that on one hand yet another suicide attempt would have been mad, her father would not have wanted to see her again simply because she was mad, etc. and that on the other if she were sane she would have wanted to live, her father should have seen her, her statements would be truthful, etc. Unfortunately Dr. Campbell never attempts to see beyond simplistic notions of madness and sanity, polarized and riddled with subjective values; on the contrary, he seeks to exploit such notions and manipulate them in his own favor.

(Underestimation of Rhetorical Context)

Guilty or not of what he is suspected of, Dr. Campbell either way seriously underestimates the consequences of professional imprecision in a legal context, and fails to appreciate the necessity and moreover the duty of such professionalism to communicate clearly with a larger public. Indeed, his concept of professionalism seems entirely condescending and one-sided; it is as if his knowledge was not accompanied by any responsibility to communicate itself, as if he felt it entitled him to respect without obliging him to make himself understood. The whole pamphlet shows him subsequently making the effort, but awkwardly and too late. Whatever else he might have done, he has certainly miscalculated on the level of rhetoric.